

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

174



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,428	04/19/2001	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920010015US1	3585

35525 7590 06/14/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

224

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/838,428	JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/23/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 14, lines 27-29: "If the user has not opted to have the text presented without the video, then the video and text is presented to the user" should read: "If the user has not opted to have the text presented without **filtering text from** the video, then the video and text is presented to the user".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 17 and 19 recite the limitation "output data" in lines 1-2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested that the claims be reworded to read: "The method as recited in claim [give appropriate claim number], wherein the step of outputting the associated text data comprises outputting a plurality of sets of text data..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rogers (U.S. Patent 5,915,256).

As per claim 1, Rogers discloses a method where multimedia data is received containing associated text data. (See Rogers, Figure 2, and Column 4, lines 23-27). The associated text data is extracted from the multimedia data (See Rogers, Column 4, lines 56-63) and is outputted without the moving images from the multimedia data. (See Rogers, Figure 9, and Column 5, lines 56-59).

As per claim 8, Rogers discloses a computer program product in a computer readable media for the invention as described in the rejection of claim 1. (See Rogers, Figure 1, and Column 4, lines 9-21).

Claim 15 is rejected on the same basis as claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers (U.S. Patent 5,915,256) as applied to claims 1, 8, and 15 above, and further in view of Gibbon (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0078188 A1).

As per claim 2, Rogers discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rogers does not disclose expressly that the associated text data is made up of a number of sets of text data, or that the step of outputting the associated text data includes outputting a single video frame from the multimedia corresponding to one of the sets of text data. Gibbon discloses a system where the text data is comprised of a number of sets of data. (See Gibbon, Page 7, paragraph 0109). The sets of text data are presented to the user along with a single video frame corresponding to one of the sets of text data. (See Gibbon, figure 14). Rogers and Gibbon are analogous art because they come from the same field of endeavor of determining alternate methods to present multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the data extraction and output method of Rogers with the data segmentation of Gibbon. The motivation for doing so would have been to make it easier for the user to browse the text information in a compact form while maintaining the intended meaning. (See Gibbon, page 7, paragraph 0109-0111). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gibbon with Rogers for the benefit of improved output presentation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claims 2 and 8.

Claim 16 is rejected on the same basis as claims 2 and 15.

As per claim 3, Rogers discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rogers does not disclose expressly that the several sets of output data are presented to the user simultaneously. Gibbon discloses a system where the text data is comprised of a number of sets of data. (See Gibbon, Page 7, paragraph 0109). Gibbon also discloses that the data segments are shown to the user simultaneously. (See Gibbon, page 8, paragraph 0123). Rogers and Gibbon are analogous art because they come from the same field of endeavor of determining alternate methods to present multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the data output method of Rogers with the data presentation of Gibbon. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to view multiple segments of data simultaneously, thus providing coherency to the data content. (See Gibbon, page 8, paragraph 0124). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gibbon with Rogers for the benefit of improved data representation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Claim 10 is rejected on the same basis as claims 3 and 8.

Claim 17 is rejected on the same basis as claims 3 and 15.

As per claim 4, Rogers and Gibbon disclose the limitations of claim 3 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that the several sets or segments of data are presented in separate frames. (See Gibbon, figure 16 and page 8, paragraph 0122).

Claim 11 is rejected on the same basis as claims 4 and 10.

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis as claims 4 and 17.

As per claim 5, Rogers discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rogers does not disclose expressly that the output data is made up of a number of sets of data, or that each set of data is presented to the user individually in a sequential order. Gibbon discloses a system where the text data is comprised of a number of sets of data. (See Gibbon, Page 7, paragraph 0109). Gibbon also discloses that each set of data is presented to the user individually in a sequential order. (See Gibbon, page 7, paragraphs 0116-0117). Rogers and Gibbon are analogous art because they come from the same field of endeavor of determining alternate methods to present multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the data output method of Rogers with the data segmentation and presentation of Gibbon. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to view the data in chronological order. (See Gibbon, page 7, paragraph 0116). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gibbon with Rogers to allow the output data to be presented to the user in a logical progression to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Claim 12 is rejected on the same basis as claims 5 and 8.

Claim 19 is rejected on the same basis as claims 5 and 15.

As per claim 6, Rogers and Gibbon disclose the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Gibbon also discloses that the next set or segment of data in the sequential order is presented in response to an action by the user to display the next set of data. (See Gibbon, page 7, paragraph 0117).

Claim 13 is rejected on the same basis as claims 6 and 12.

Claim 20 is rejected on the same basis as claims 6 and 19.

Art Unit: 2176

As per claim 7, Rogers discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rogers does not disclose expressly that the step of extracting the associated text data includes parsing the multimedia data to determine the associated text data and discarding any moving image data. Gibbon discloses that the text data is extracted from the multimedia data and is stored and presented separately from the moving image data. (See Gibbon, figure 5, element 5040, and page 3, paragraph 0037).). Rogers and Gibbon are analogous art because they come from the same field of endeavor of determining alternate methods to present multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the data extraction method of Rogers with the data division, storage and presentation of Gibbon. The motivation for doing so would have been to divide the differing types of data for the purpose of enhancing the data storage and retrieval process. (See Gibbon, page 3, paragraph 0035, and figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gibbon with Rogers for the benefit of improved data storage to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Claim 14 is rejected on the same basis as claims 7 and 8.

Claim 21 is rejected on the same basis as claims 7 and 15.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2176

- Dimitrova (U.S. Patent 6,363,380 B1) discloses a system with story segmentation capability.
- Nelson (U.S. Patent 6,243,713 B1) discloses a system and method for multimedia document retrieval and indexing for queries containing various data types.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is 703-605-1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER